

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

QUNTIUS D. SAUNDERS, #657148,

Petitioner,

Civil No. 2:11-CV-14863  
Honorable Denise Page Hood

v.

KEN ROMANOWSKI,

Respondent.

---

**ORDER DENYING WITHOUT PREJUDICE PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR  
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL [Dkt. 14]**

On November 4, 2011, Petitioner Kenneth Daniels, a state inmate, filed a pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254, alleging that he is incarcerated in violation of his constitutional rights. Pending before the Court is his motion for appointment of counsel. For the reasons set forth below, the Court will deny the motion without prejudice.

The constitutional right to counsel in criminal proceedings provided by the Sixth Amendment does not apply to an application for writ of habeas corpus, which is a civil proceeding. *Cobas v. Burgess*, 306 F.3d 441, 444 (6th Cir. 2002), cert. denied, 538 U.S. 984 (2003), reh. denied, 539 U.S. 970 (2003). The Court has broad discretion in determining whether counsel should be appointed. *Childs v. Pellegrin*, 822 F.2d 1382, 1384 (6th Cir. 1987). A habeas petitioner may obtain representation at any stage of the case "[w]henever the United States magistrate or the court determines that the interests of justice so require." 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B). In this case, after the Court has carefully reviewed the pleadings and state court record, if the Court determines that appointment of counsel is necessary, then it will do so at that time. Petitioner need not file any

further motions regarding this issue.

Accordingly, **IT IS ORDERED** that Petitioner's "Motion for Appointment of Counsel" is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

**SO ORDERED.**

S/Arthur J. Tarnow

Arthur J. Tarnow  
Senior United States District Judge

Dated: November 7, 2012

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon parties/counsel of record on November 7, 2012, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

S/Catherine A. Pickles

Judicial Secretary